

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-4, 6-7 are pending in this application. Claim 5 has been cancelled. Independent claims 1 and 6 are amended to incorporate scanner and processor components for performing steps to highlight the particular device used for performing the invention.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-4, 6-7 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claims 1 and 6 are amended to incorporate scanner and processor components for performing steps to highlight the particular device used for performing the invention. Accordingly, it is submitted that the invention is directed to an invention that is performed by a particular machine, and the claims should be found to be directed to statutory subject matter under the requirements identified by the Examiner.

Claim 4 includes a step of printing. Printing is a transformative step that further contributes to the patentable subject matter of that claim.

For these reasons, the rejections under § 101 may be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-7 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pintsov, Patent Number: 6,125,357 (“Pintsov”).

Pintsov shows an example of how it was known to include information from the address block in the postage indicia, in order to allow verification of the postage mark. This general concept was also acknowledged in the background section of the present application. (See e.g. paras. 10, 11.) There are a number of different ways described in which address information has been incorporated into the postage indicia to enhance

security. With respect to the asserted Pintsov reference, it is taught that certain characters are taken from select positions in the address block, which are then included in the indicia. See Fig. 1: **26, 28, 30**; col. 6, lines 34-58.

The difference of the present application is that particular characters from the address block are not being used. Rather, a “digital image” and an “image digest” of the address block are being incorporated into the indicia and used for verification. The acknowledged prior art, and the Pintsov reference do not teach or suggest using an image of the address block. Use of the image provides flexibility, since it is not necessary to interpret, or understand, the characters in the address block. This new invention even allows that the address block may include non-standard formatting, or foreign characters. These novel and non-obvious features are further described in the specification at paragraphs 26-29.

Because Pintsov fails to disclose or suggest the missing features of using a “digital image” of the address block to generate an “address block image digest”, to compare with an “image digest” stored in the digital postage mark, it is submitted that the rejections of independent claims 1, 4, and 6, along with their dependent claims, should be withdrawn.

Appln. No.: 10/582,741

Amendment Dated: November 19, 2009

Reply to Office Action dated August 19, 2009

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the claims of this application are now in a condition for allowance and favorable action thereon is requested. Please charge any additional fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 16-1885.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Cummings/

Michael J. Cummings

Reg. No. 46,650

Attorney of Record

Telephone (203) 924-3934

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-3000